

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF TENNESSEE

FILED

December 7, 1995

Cecil Crowson, Jr.

Appellate Court Clerk

BENNY E. SHOPE and wife,) C/A NO. 03A01-9508-CV-00288
BETTY S. SHOPE,) BRADLEY COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT

)
Plaintiffs-Appellants,)

1

v.)

)
)
)
)
)
)
) HONORABLE EARLE G. MURPHY,
) JUDGE

RADIO SHACK, a division of)
TANDY CORPORATION, and RADIO)
SHACK, INC., a corporation doing)
business in Bradley County,)
Tennessee,)
)

Defendants-Appellees.)

CONCURRING OPINION

I concur in the result reached by the majority. I believe it is clear, under **Eaton v. McClain**, 891 S.W.2d 587, 595 (Tenn. 1994), a post-**McIntyre** decision of the Supreme Court, that the law in Tennessee is still to the effect that an owner of premises does not have to warn an invitee of a danger that is "open and obvious." I believe the application of this principle, without more, justifies the trial court's grant of a directed verdict in this case. Here, the condition was "open and obvious." Therefore, there was no duty to warn. Since the plaintiffs' case was predicated on the alleged violation of a duty to warn, and since their proof did not demonstrate the existence of that duty, the defendants were entitled to a directed verdict. If there is no duty, there can be no

negligence. *Doe v. Linder Constr. Co. Inc.*, 845 S.W.2d 173, 178 (Tenn. 1992). I believe that the rationale of this concurring opinion is all that is required to justify affirming the court below. I would go no further.

Charles D. Susano, Jr., J.